

Interview Summary

Application No.

09/283,389

Applicant(s)

Jay S. Walker et al

Examiner

Mussie Tesfamariam

Art Unit

3622



All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Mussie Tesfamariam

(3) _____

(2) Magdalena Fincham

(4) _____

Date of Interview Nov 6, 2002Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conferencec) ☐ Personal [copy is given to 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No. If yes, brief description:Claim(s) discussed: 1

Identification of prior art discussed:

Woolston, 5,845,265Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Applicant has argued that woolston doesn't disclose or suggest second product. However the Examiner disagree. Because Woolston disclose in second product. See col 12, lines 45-66.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Mussie Tesfamariam
Examiner's signature, if required